RECEIVED CENTRAL FAX CENTER

CONFIDENTIAL

MAR 3 1 2005

TO EXAMINER: Ganey	FAX#:	703-872-9306
GROUP ART UNIT: 3752		
ADDRESS: U.S. Patent and Trademark Office		
P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450		
EXAMINER PHONE: <u>571-272-4899</u>		
Transmitted here with regarding Attorney docket no. <u>50051</u>	_Application	Serial No. <u>10/081,419,</u>
Filed 2/22/2002, are the following:		
Transmittal Form		
Fee Transmittal Form		
PTO form 2038, Credit Card Payment Form for pay	ment in the an	nount of \$n
Petition for Extension of Time		
X Response under 37 CFR 1.11 (7 pages)		
Terminal Disclaimer		
I hereby certify that this correspondence and all accompanying this correspondence is being addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P 22313-1450 fax # 703-872-9306, on March 31-2005.	transmitted 2.0. Box 14	by facsimile and
Sue Z. Shape	er, Reg. No.	31663
7 PAGE(S) TO FOLLOW THIS COVER SHE	ET	
IF YOU DO NOT RECEIVE THE CORRECT N	IUMBER C	F PAGES,

RECEIVED CENTRAL FAX CENTER MAR 3 1 2005

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant(s): Williams

Application No.: 10/081,419

Filed: 2/22/2002

Title: Around-the-Pump Additive System for Industrial

Scale Hazards

Attorney Docket No.: 50051

Examiner:

Art Unit:

Examiner:

Ganey

3752

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RESPONSE TO OFFICE COMMUNICATION MAILED 3/25/05

Dear Sir:

Attached for your records please find a paper copy of our <u>prior</u> Response to the Office Action of July 13, 2004, <u>as it was mailed first class mail</u> with Certificate of Mailing on October 13, 2004, received in the Patent Office on October 18, 2004. This copy comports with both the paper copies and the electronic record in our files.

Greg Vidovich, in your offices, was very helpful and gave this issue some attention in your absence. He recited to me over the phone that your "scanned" electronic record of the amended claim 1, line 7, does <u>not</u> recite "upstream of the pump water manifold inlet"! Rather it recites "upstream of a pump water manifold inlet"!!

Neither Greg nor I can understand <u>how</u> the word "the" in the amended portion of claim 1 line 7 became an "a" in your scanned portion. And judging from your Office Communication mailed 3/25/5 this error in the scanned copy happened in the amended portion of each independent claim, that is in claims 1, 9, 16 and 17.

There were other odd errors in the scanned copy of the claims that Greg noted.

I have been told that the scanning is now out-sourced and that the original paper copy submitted is discarded. We can submit affidavits, therefore, if helpful, to the effect that the copy now being faxed to you was exactly what was submitted on 10/13/4.

If you review the faxed copy, you will see that the Office Communication of 3/25/05 was unnecessary. Applicant did <u>not</u> have a separate recitation of a water pump manifold inlet yielding a recitation of <u>two</u> pump manifolds. Rather, independent claims

1, 9, 16 and 17 as amended recited a water pump having "a" manifold inlet and subsequent lines in the claim made reference to "the" pump manifold inlet.

May I request that you fax to me a copy of the claims as you now carry them electronically, your official copy. I should like to check for any and all discrepancies that could lead both of us to waste time and could lead to the wrong set of claims being prosecuted!

You can also, of course, compare the paper copy <u>re</u>submitted to you with what you have in your word processing system. I should just like to double check.

Unfortunately, at least at this time, it appears to be in the best interest of a patentee to make this check with <u>every</u> amendment. Within the last two months a design patent examiner requested that I <u>resubmit</u> drawings. The originals had been "scanned incorrectly." She is the one who informed me that the scanning is now out-sourced and that the paper copies are thrown away.

If you have the time, since I alone have run into two instances within the last two months of "erroneous scanning," in particular of the <u>claims</u> section of an application, I wish that you could bring this to the attention of those who supervise these matters. If you would send me a name and address, I will also bring it to their attention. I think that the paper copies need to be <u>retained</u>.

In conclusion, Applicant submits that there is, and has been, no lack of being fully responsive to the prior Office Action. This is clear when the proper claims attachment, as submitted, is reviewed. If affidavits to that effect are required, please let me know.

Respectfully submitted,

Date Su

Sue Z. Shaper

Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)

Reg. No. 31663

Sue Z. Shaper 1800 West Loop South, Suite 1450 Houston, Texas 77027 Tel. 713 550 5710

Fax 713 550 5709